REMARKS

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 3, 10, 12, 19 and 30.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-10, 12-19, 21-30 and 32-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Rosenschein *et al.* (USPN 6,519,631 B1).

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 11, 20 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rosenschein *et al.* in view of Mahmoud, "Registration and Discovery of Web Services Using JAXR with XML Registries such as UDDI and ebXML", June 2002.

Applicants respectfully traverse the claim objections, the § 102 rejections, and the § 103 rejections with the following arguments.

10/613,560   15

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 3, 10, 12, 19 and 30, "because of the following informality: 'closet' should be spelled as – closest –."

In response, Applicant has amended claims to correct the typographical error identified by the Examiner; i.e., Applicant has changed 'closet' to 'closest' in claims 1, 10, 19, and 30

However, claims 3 and 12 do not contain the spelling error identified by the Examiner.

10/613,560   16

35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-10, 12-19, 21-30 and 32-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Rosenschein *et al.* (USPN 6,519,631 B1).

Table 1 depicts the Examiner's interpretation of how various recited words and phrases claimed by Applicant are represented in Rosenschein.

Table 1

Claimed By Applicant	Represented in Rosenschein (as alleged by Examiner)
remote host	server 30
web server host	servers 90, 92, 94
first portion of document	designated word
at least one additional portion of document	context-indicating words

Applicants respectfully contend that Rosenschein does not anticipate claims 1, 10, 19, and 30, because Rosenschein does not teach each and every feature of claims 1, 10, 19, and 30, as illustrated in the following examples in light of the Examiner's allegations in Table 1.

As a first example of why Rosenschein does not anticipate claims 1, 10, 19, and 30, Rosenschein does not teach the feature: "sequentially transmitting, by the remote host to the web service host, at least one additional portion of the document".

10/613,560   17

Applicant maintains that Rosenschein does not teach that the context-indicating words are transmitted by the server 30 to the servers 90, 92, 94.

The Examiner alleges that Rosenschein teaches "transmission of the context-indicating words as part of a query to server 90 in order to change the context of the query with just the designated word.".

In response, Applicant notes that the Examiner has not provided a citation in Rosenschein to support the preceding allegation of what Rosenschein allegedly teaches, and Applicant maintains that no such citation can be found in Rosenschein.

Moreover, Rosenschein teaches that the analysis of the context-indicating words are performed by the server 30 or the client computer 52 (see Rosenschein, col. 9, lines 11-15). Rosenschein does not teach that the servers 90, 92, 94 perform any analysis or any other operation on the context-indicating words.

As a second example of why Rosenschein does not anticipate claims 1, 10, 19, and 30, Rosenschein does not teach the feature: "wherein the first portion and the at least one additional portion collectively comprise the entire document".

Thus, Applicant asserts that in Rosenschein, the designated word and the context-indicating words do not collectively comprise the entire document. Rosenschein, col. 8, line 66 - col. 9, line 1 recites: "Typically, some of the context-indicating words are drawn from the same sentence as that including the designated word ...". Rosenschein does not teach that said sentence consists of the designated word and the context-indicating words to an exclusion of any other word in the sentence.

10/613,560   18

condition for allowance.

In addition, Applicants maintain that Rosenschein does not anticipate claims 5-9, 14-18, 23-27, and 35-38, because:

(a) Rosenschein does not teach said extracting ("extracting text from said entire document to configure said text in a text format, **if said entire document received by said web service host comprises said text in a non-text format**");

(b) Rosenschein does not teach said generating ("generating document keys associated with said text **from analysis of said text** in said text format, if said entire document received by said web service host comprises said text in said text format, or if said web service host has previously performed said extracting such that said text in said text format is available to said web service host"); and

(c) Rosenschein does not teach said determining ("determining, from given categories of a document taxonomy, a set of closest categories to the document **based on a comparison between the document keys and category keys of the given categories**, if said entire document received by said web service host comprises said document keys, or if said web service host has previously performed said generating such that said document keys are available to said web service host").

With respect to said extracting, Rosenschein does not teach that said extracting is performed conditionally "if said entire document received by said web service host comprises said text in a non-text format".

With respect to said generating, Rosenschein teaches in col. 9, lines 58-61 that the

10/613,560   20

context-determining algorithm receives the words s_1, s_2, ..., s_n (alleged by Examiner to be document keys) from client 52, rather than "from analysis of said text".

With respect to said determining, Rosenschein does not teach determining a set of closest categories to the document "based on a comparison between the document keys and category keys of the given categories". The Examiner alleges that s_1, s_2, ..., s_n are the document keys. The Examiner's allegation that the concepts c_j ($j=1$, 2, ..., N) are the categories implies that the keywords k_1, k_2, ..., k_n are the category keys. However, Rosenschein does not teach that s_1, s_2, ..., s_n are compared with k_1, k_2, ..., k_n to determine a set of closest categories. Rather, the category weight matrix elements W_{ij} are utilized, in combination with the modified positional weights p_1, p_2, ..., p_N, to compute the score $S(c_j)$ in the equation depicted in Rosenschein, col. 10, lines 42-44.

10/613,560   21

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 11, 20 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly

being unpatentable over Rosenschein *et al.* in view of Mahmoud, "Registration and Discovery of

Web Services Using JAXR with XML Registries such as UDDI and ebXML", June 2002.

Since claims 2, 11, 20 and 31 respectively depend from claims 1, 10, 19, and 30, which

Applicants have argued *supra* to not be unpatentable over Rosenschein under 35 U.S.C. §102(b),

Applicants maintain that claims 2, 11, 20 and 31 are likewise not unpatentable over Rosenschein

in view of Mahmoud under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In addition, Rosenschein in view of Mahmoud does not teach or suggest the feature:

"executing a Universal Description, Discovery, and Integration (UDDI) search to identify one or

more web services hosts who can receive said document in chunks and who can perform

said at least one of said extracting, generating, and stemming".

The Examiner argues: "Mahmoud does teach a executing a Universal Description,

Discovery, and Integration (UDDI) search".

In response, Applicants respectively contend that Mahmoud does not disclose executing a

Universal Description, Discovery, and Integration (UDDI) search "to identify one or more web

services hosts who can receive said document in chunks and who can perform said at least one of

said extracting, generating, and stemming".

10/613,560   22

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims

and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request

favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the

application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact

Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby

authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457.

Date: 03/16/2006

Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850

10/613,560   23